



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ✧EDITORIAL✧NOTES.✧

---

**A Correction.**—On page 185, line 20, of December number, instead of “Sak-hur” should be read Shikkor.

---

**The Revised Old Testament.**—We may expect it in May, 1885. We shall first be supplied by the American agents of the University presses at Cambridge and Oxford. There will probably be fewer independent American editions than there were of the revised New Testament. The Chicago daily, which with so much enterprise published, by telegraph, the entire New Testament on the first morning after its appearance in New York, will hardly undertake a similar publication of the Revised Old Testament.

But what will be the attitude of Bible-readers to this new version? It will receive very much the same treatment, we imagine, that was accorded to the New Testament. It will be accepted by some, by others criticized and put aside. Yet, upon the whole, it will be received more cordially. What basis is there for this opinion? In the first place, it is conceded by all that in the case of the Old Testament there was more room for improvement, and indeed more need of it. This feeling is well nigh universal; and many who regarded the authorized version of the New Testament as satisfactory, and were ill-disposed toward the revised version, will be entirely willing to accept the revised version of the Old. Every thinking man appreciates the fact that the relative advance in Old Testament scholarship since the time of King James as compared with that of New Testament scholarship is very great. And the knowledge of this fact will do much to reconcile even the most conservative to the new translation. Again, much of the hostility to the Revised New Testament was due to the fact that men would not consent to read otherwise than as they had been accustomed, those words and phrases which had become so familiar from long use. While, with some, there will be entertained the same feeling, in reference to certain parts of the Old Testament, e. g., the Psalms and Isaiah, yet this feeling will be neither so general, nor so intense, nor so well-grounded. There is not in the case of many Christians such a degree of familiarity with Old Testament forms of expression as to prejudice them deeply against such changes as will be found to have been made.

It is also true, that public sentiment is not so fixed in reference to these matters as it was four years ago. Whatever may be said of the slowness with which the Revised New Testament is coming into use, we believe that it is *coming*. And all the progress which it has made may be counted as that much gain for the Revised Old Testament. Had the New Testament followed the Old, there would have been far less opposition to it. The wedge which began, four years ago, to enter, has gone deeper than many suppose. The Revised Old Testament has all the advantage which accrues from the position held to-day by the Revised New Testament in the face of prejudice and criticism. A final point deserves consideration.

Old Testament *scholars* will welcome this revision more warmly than New Testament scholars did the New Testament. Where fifty men hastened to exhibit their scholarship by a so-called criticism of the revision of the New, there will be but one who will desire to do this in the case of the Old Testament. The fact is, that outside of the Revision Committee, there are not many, the number can be counted on one's fingers, who will dare to criticize the work of that Committee. The leaders in Old Testament study will welcome the revision, and their example will have a weighty influence.

This revision, in which we are all so deeply interested, for which we have waited so long and so patiently, will present the results of the best Semitic scholarship of our age. It is not the work of any one man. It is not the work of any one class of men. It ought at once to be accepted, in the family, in the pulpit, everywhere. However short it may come of what any particular individual may have desired, it will be vastly superior to the old version. If it were better than the old version, in but a dozen cases, this would be reason enough for its adoption.

When this long-expected book appears, let us pray that the members of the Revision Committee will, individually, accept, in general, the work of the Committee, and not attack with hostile spirit those with whom they have so long labored; and also that, by some divine providence, those brethren, who suppose themselves gifted in these matters, but really are not, may be influenced to remain silent, at least until there has been time to consider fairly the character of the revision as a whole.

---

**How to learn to interpret.**—In the December STUDENT, something was said concerning Interpretation and Translation. It was asserted, that while by translating a given passage one might learn what had been *said*, there remained the still more difficult task of determining the *thought* intended to be conveyed by the person speaking. As will be seen, the question of translation relates to the field of linguistic study; that of interpretation to a field, much broader, one, indeed, whose limits cannot easily be set. How shall one proceed, that he may learn how to get at the thought of a writer? Or, to put the question in another form, how shall one proceed to teach another *how to interpret*? There are two or three methods in use which may fairly be regarded as inadequate and impracticable:

1) The instructor reads to his pupils long and carefully wrought-out dissertations on Hermeneutics. They are told what to do, what not to do. The principles of interpretation are arranged in logical order. Hair-splitting distinctions are made between this and that. A multitude of details are presented for consideration. Rules, covering every imaginable case, are prescribed. And yet, notwithstanding all this information, the student is at a loss to know how to proceed to the actual work of interpretation. Indeed he does not proceed. Nor can he, so bewildered is he by what has been told him.

2) The instructor dictates page after page of so-called exegesis. He seeks by this, first to teach his students the only correct interpretation of the chapter or book thus considered; secondly, to teach them, by the example, which he thus furnishes them, how to interpret for themselves other portions of Scripture. The exegetical notes thus obtained by the student are carefully laid aside. There is